

Again, but for an accidental inquiry, we should have had no testimony from this council of the undoubted existence, the universal prevalence, of Infant Baptism, in at least all that district of country in which these sixty-six bishops resided—from which we may plainly see of what little force against Infant Baptism the silence of authors is to be regarded, when but for a mere accident there would have been entire silence on this subject even in this council. Even now, when the Scriptural character of Infant Baptism is so hotly contested by Anti-Pædo-Baptists, you will scarcely find a single author among them who does not introduce the subject; you will meet with many Pædo-Baptists who have little, many who have nothing at all on the subject, even when the contrary might be expected. I will instance in two cases, one in Mosheim's *De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum*, even in that passage, Ch. V., note, in which he speaks of the Jewish proselyte baptism as preceding John's baptism, he makes no mention of their baptizing infants; another, in Horne's *Introduction*, Part III., ch. 2, § 2, where this proselyte baptism is also treated of, but no mention of Infant Baptism.

You labor very hard to do away, then, with this perfect evidence of the entire establishment and wide prevalence of Infant Baptism in the year after St. John, 153, but ineffectually.

You begin with saying you submit four or five propositions. First. You say that you have demonstrated that "Infant Baptism did not originate with Christ or his Apostles . . . but in the beginning of the third century." I trust I have clearly proven